

Landscape GIS Framework Meeting

October 12, 1999

Location: CDF Headquarters, Tulare Ranger Unit

Participants:

Aaron Gelobter
Pat Lineback
Karen Folger
MaryBeth Keifer
Tony Caprio
Joe Millar
Robin Marose
Dorothy Albright

Discussion:

- **Review agenda and meeting purpose (Pat)**
- **There is a Spatial Data/Analysis Collaboration Hierarchy (see below):**
 - 1) None – Data collaboration is minor or nonexistent
 - 2) Basic data exchange level is where we are NOW- must deal w/ differences
 - 3) Standardized data models
 - individual agencies responsible and implement agreed upon joint standards
 - collaborative development (this is what we will be doing with this project)
 - 4) Analysis models developed and based on agencies common needs – Hazard, other?
 - 5) Interagency Fire Mgmt planning – coordinated fuels management planning and treatment
 - 6) Implement business processes needed to maintain standard data models, analyses, etc.
- **Project objectives review - (Page 3 of Proposal)**
 - Tech and contractor will be spending most of their time on objective # 2 - gathering, developing, and merging data.
 - What will they be working on? Steering committee to decide ultimately as long as it stays within the framework of the original project. Have to focus on fuels layer development and maintenance as a major part of this project
 - We will need annual data updates for fire history.
 - Produce comprehensive maps, analyses, etc – what everyone wants to see
 - Don't reinvent all methods, but use existing collaboration efforts & methods, such as what the California Fuels Committee has already worked on.
 - Establish strong partnership with major stakeholders. This has to be emphasized if the project is to succeed.
 - Write multi-year fuels treatment plan based on analyses for large geographic area still to be defined
- **Deliverables (Reference section in the proposal)**
 - Develop a Data clearinghouse and related GroupWare sharing with a fire focus
 - Scaleable so it can be used by others (e.g. other programmatic areas such as exotic species management.

- **Concerns about proposal?**

- Robin: Similar to what CDF attempted w/ CA fire plan – but didn't develop partnerships adequately. Became a "CDF" plan and much coarser resolution of data analysis.
 - Robin also concerned with lack of local CDF representation. Tulare County does not have a prefire engineer right now.

- **Robin - Identifying an appropriate Values model(s) will be difficult (i.e., What is ecosystem health?)**

- Pat assumes there will one or more interagency core groups developing model parameters
 - How do we fit in w/ other initiatives. People on group such as Robin and Dorothy need to assure that we are integrating our efforts with other initiatives (FIREScope standards to be used?)
 - Make sure our implementation standards are within our fiscal capabilities.
 - Transportation data? – Robin: ETAK may be developing a new statewide road layer that we would have to purchase.
 - Should roads be a concern? Aaron: He wants to be able to have road data that matches SNF when he uses ArcView. Would be happy to get even that. We most likely will need a roads layer, but attributing will have to be defined.
 - Which layers are important? Steering Committee will have to identify priorities.
 - Report on other studies needed; future projects
 - Identifying stakeholders may drive steering committee involvement

- **Identify project area**

- Suggestion we take a watershed approach to managing data for this initiative. Two maps were made and on the wall to illustrate the watershed approach. "Old" emergency response zone developed by a small GIS alliance 1.5 years ago was shown.
 - Fits well for USFS, maybe not so well for CDF. They currently manage data via ranger units or counties.
 - Watersheds doesn't have jurisdictional boundaries.
 - The following six watersheds were identified as the starting point for this GIS consortium.
Kings, Kaweah, Kern, Tule, Caliente, Mojave Total land area is around 4.5 million acres. BLM needed as partner. They are scattered everywhere with land ownership. Includes Kern County (contracting with State CDF) – Dave Ward?

- **Name choices**

- SOSGIC – Southern Sierra Geographic Information Consortium
 - GIFC – Geographic Information Fire Consortium
 - GIFPC – Geographic Information Fire Planning Consortium
 - FPIC – Fire Planning Information Consortium
 - GFPC – Geographic Fire Planning Consortium
 - WILDPLAN – Interagency Wildland Fire Planning Consortium

- The group couldn't agree on a name and decided to move on.

- PLEASE** – Think about what might be a good name for this interagency initiative and pass on to Pat.

- **Identify stakeholders**

- a) Steering committee will have major stakeholders (e.g. NPS, USFS, and CDF) b) everybody else will be minor stakeholders (e.g. Mountain Home State Forest)

Steering Committee Members = Desirable: 1 GIS and 1 fire person from each of the major stakeholders

- 1) USFS – Total of 3. Sequoia NF– Aaron and ?; Dorothy Albright
- 2) Kern County – Need to ask Chief Clark (Aaron to make contact); optimal would be two
- 3) CDF – Total of 2 or 3; Robin and one or two people from ranger district (includes Tulare county) no pre-fire engineer hired yet (Aaron to follow-up on this)
- 4) NPS – Bill and Pat (NPS - David Delsordo? Logistics from Seattle may be too much)
- 5) BLM Bakersfield District– One fire and one GIS person (Aaron to contact and find appropriate contacts). Might need a third participant.

Additional Stakeholders

USFS – Sierra NF
BLM – Desert District (in Mojave watershed)
State Fish & Game
BIA
Tule Indian Reservation
Mtn Home State forest
China Lake
Army corps of engineers
USFWS
Bureau of Reclamation
State Parks
Fire safe councils – Tulare and Kern valley
Other CDF ranger units? – Fresno/Kings; region office
Nature Conservancy
Watershed Councils
University Lands
CA fuels committee
CA fire prevention
Air quality districts
Water districts
Utilities

- **How to get stakeholders involved/motivated to participate**

-Extremely important to get stakeholder involvement and interest and get them to become partners in this initiative.

-One alternative is to invite them to a workshop. Two workshops alternative presented by Pat.

1) Identify Geospatial applications for fire mgmt – workshop to develop range of geospatial fire applications – both current and future. Write a professional paper on results. Invite stakeholders and conduct a follow-up meeting of steering committee to begin actual project work including information needs assessment.

How are people using, models, etc. – preliminary development

Professional facilitator?

Use as a mechanism to educate steering committee/stakeholders

Survey on technology/what's going on – models, etc.

2) Develop a workshop that focuses on educating stakeholders on geospatial and information technologies as a way for improving ecosystem management. Focus on breaking the “glass ceiling” of organizational barriers that currently exist for joint sharing and development of data. Important to identify and consider expectations of stakeholders– us/them

Aaron was concerned that a workshop should be preceded by an educational session with the stakeholders. This needs to occur first. Dorothy felt that we needed to reach out at this same meeting and find out what their expectations were.

It was agreed that the next meeting would be on **Dec 9th at the Porterville SO, USFS from 0900-1630**
(this is a revised date from what was originally agreed to at the meeting)

The meeting purpose would be twofold: a) the morning would focus on educating the Steering Committee members on the proposal and what it means. Would also determine steering committees expectations. b) The afternoon would be a steering committee meeting focusing on a variety of subjects including:

Workshop Decisions – should we and what kind

Funding – how will agencies fund their own positions (in-kind), esp. USFS allocations

- Validation concerns, could be part of future recommendations. How appropriated funds will be managed?

How to measure success

Staff location – deferred

MOU – Aaron volunteers to draft. Pat will fax him a template of an Information Technology MOU

Web hosting/collaboration decisions will need to be made – how, where, CD-ROM data, data management strategies

- **Grant Sources (We need to go after some additional funds – Pat to take lead)**
 - a) ESRI Desktop software available through a Grant Program. Need to provide technician and contractor with software and hardware. Can reduce costs this way.
 - b) Federal Geographic Data Committee (FGDC) – Grants to develop data clearinghouses are available.

Pat and Aaron to collaborate on an educational presentation for the steering committee including a PowerPoint presentation and handout(s).